



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/916,918	07/27/2001	Radu Victor Balan	2001P13674 US	8793
75	90 11/24/2004		EXAMINER	
Siemens Corporation			OPSASNICK, MICHAEL N	
Intellectual Property Department 186 Wood Avenue South Iselin, NJ 08830			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		•	2655	

DATE MAILED: 11/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/916,918	BALAN ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael N. Opsasnick	2655	
The MAILING DATE of this communicate Period for Reply	ition appears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION of time may be available under the provisions of after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communiation of the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) of the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutes are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will any reply received by the Office later than three months after earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATION. 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a received in the statutory minimum of thirt ory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON I. by statute, cause the application to become AB	eply be timely filed y (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed	on <u>27 July 2001</u> .		
,—)⊠ This action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for closed in accordance with the practice			
Disposition of Claims			
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the approach 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction	withdrawn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the E	Examiner.		
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a			
Applicant may not request that any objection			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including th 11) The oath or declaration is objected to b		· ·	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
·	ocuments have been received. Ocuments have been received in A Ocuments have been	pplication No received in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		summary (PTO-413)	
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTC 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PT Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/27/2001. 		s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-152) 	

Art Unit: 2655

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

2. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Art Unit: 2655

4. Claims 1-11,14,15,17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Leahy et al (6219045).

As per claims 1,14, and 15, <u>Leahy et al (6219045)</u> teaches a virtual environment system (abstract) comprising:

"an acoustic localizer....environment" as determining the sound location (col. 5 lines 1-10)

"a user data...remote data...system controller.....I/O device" as client/server relationship (Fig. 2);

"wherein control of said remote data....localizer" as controller determines position of the user (col. 5 lines 15-25);

"wherein data.....said user" as remote data transmission (fig. 2, col. 3 lines 42-51)

As per claim 2, <u>Leahy et al (6219045)</u> teaches using a plurality of microphones (col. 4 lines 62-66).

As per claim 3,18,19, <u>Leahy et al (6219045)</u> teaches transmission thru I/O device (fig. 2, col. 3 liens 42-51).

As per claim 4, Leahy et al (6219045) teaches video and sound (fig. 4),

As per claims 5-11, Leahy et al (6219045) teaches I/O of computing devices (including PDA's, wireless, and differing video input - \rightarrow col. 3 lines 51-67).

Art Unit: 2655

As per claim 17, <u>Leahy et al (6219045)</u> teaches position determination (col. 5 lines 15-25).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. Claims 12,13, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leahy et al (6219045) in view of Geilhife et al (6584439).

As per claims 12, 13, and 16, Leahy et al (6219045) teaches commands from the user (Fig. 4, subblocks 116, including speech and motion), but Leahy et al (6219045) does not explicitly teach voice commands; however, Geilhufe et al (6584439) teaches a GUI using voice commands to control the input from the user (col. 2 lines 50-67; col. 6 lines 53-65). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of user interface design to modify the teachings of Leahy et al (6219045) so that the devices within Leahy et al (6219045) would be voice controlled because it would advantageously allow the user to control the devices without requiring buttons (Geilhife et al, col. 2 lines 63-66).

Art Unit: 2655

As per claim 16, <u>Leahy et al (6219045)</u> further teaches user position detection (col. 5 lines 15-25).

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Please see related art listed on the PTO-892 form.

8. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872 9314,

(for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington. VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Opsasnick, telephone number (703)305-4089, who is available Tuesday-Thursday, 9am-4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ms. Doris To, can be reached at (703)305-4827. The facsimile phone number for this group is (703)872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group 2600 receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4750, the 2600 Customer Service telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

mno 11/18/04

Just M. Jahn Susan mcfadden Primary examiner